Access to Financial Institution Information

Exhibit 300: Part I: Summary Information and Justification (All Capital Assets)

I.A. Overview

1. Date of Submission:

9/11/2006

2. Agency:

Social Security Administration

3. Bureau:

Systems

4. Name of this Capital Asset:

Access to Financial Institution Information

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)

016-00-01-03-01-2020-00

- 6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)

 Mixed Life Cycle
- 7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2003
- 8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

Today there are more than 6.7 million Federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) recipients in the United States. To be eligible for SSI benefits, recipients must meet specific income and resource criteria. To determine the initial and continuing entitlement to benefits, the Social Security Administration (SSA) is required to verify both the income and assets of these recipients, including those held in financial institutions (FI). Section 213 of the Foster Care Independence Act, Access to Information Held by Financial Institutions, provides SSA with the right to require applicants and recipients to authorize the Commissioner to request from any FI any record concerning an applicant or recipient financial assets. It allows SSA to obtain the information without furnishing the FI with a copy of the authorization, thereby allowing for an electronic process. We expect this to have a measurable impact on payment accuracy by allowing for a more efficient and effective verification of financial resources. A regulation has been published in support of the initiative and a proof of concept project began in calendar year 2004. The proof of concept project is included in the capital planning and investment control review for the current cycle.

- 9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?
- a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 7/13/2006
- 10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?

Yes

11. Removed

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.

Yes

- a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?
- b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)
 - 1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?
 - 2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?
 - 3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?
- 13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?

Yes

If "ves," check all that apply:

Eliminating Improper Payments

13a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? Address payment accuracy issues by aggressively pursuing strategies outlined in the SSI Corrective Action plan, such as simplifying income reporting requirements. Also supports the e-Gov initiative.

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)

Yes

a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?

Yes

b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool?

FY 06 SSI PART Q 2.8

c. If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?

Moderately Effective

15. Is this investment for information technology?

Yes

If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technology?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do not answer this subsection.

For information technology investments only:

- 16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance) Level 2
- 17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance):
- (2) Project manager qualification verification in progress.
- 18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?
- 19. Is this a financial management system? NO
 - a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?
 - 1. If "yes," which compliance area:
 - 2. If "no," what does it address?
- b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52
- 20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware

0

Software

0

Services

85.171

Other 14 829

- 21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities? $_{\mbox{\scriptsize N/A}}$
- 22. Removed
- 23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?

I.B. Summary of Funding

Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The total estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY - 1 and Earlier	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008
Planning Budgetary Resources	5.16	0.925	0.5	0.3
Acquisition Budgetary Resources	0	0	1.269	1.361
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition Budgetary Resources	5.16	0.925	1.769	1.661
Operations & Maintenance Budgetary Resources	0	0	0.196	0.712
TOTAL Budgetary Resources	5.16	0.925	1.965	2.373
Government FTE Costs Budgetary Resources	0.786	0.175	0.446	0.152
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	9	2	4	1

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

- 2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?
- a. If "yes," How many and in what year?
- 3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2007 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:
- I.C. Acquisition/Contract Strategy
- 1. Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

Contracts/Task Orders Table:

Contract	t Type of	Has the	If so what	Start date	End date	Total	Is this an	Is it	Competitively	What, if	Is EVM	Does
or Task	Contract/	contract	is the date	of	of	Value of	Interagency	performance	awarded?	any,	in the	the
Order	Task	been	of the	Contract/	Contract/	Contract/	Acquisition?	based?		alternative	contract?	contract
Number	Order	awarded?	award? If	Task	Task	Task				financing		include
			not, what	Order	Order	Order				option is		the
			is the							being		required
			planned							used?		security
			award									and
			date?									privacy
												clauses?
SS00-												
05-	Large	Yes	9/28/2005	9/29/2005	9/28/2006	0.746	No	No	No	NA	No	Yes
50411	3-											

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

SSA's earned value management (EVM) policy has been certified as consistent with OMB guidance and the ANSI standards defining a compliant EVM. The inclusion of earned value in SSA contracts is based on the type of contract let, the services performed, and the date when the contract was let. Earned value management requirements are applied to SSA contractors in two ways. The first is to require the contractor to satisfy requirements utilizing their own earned value management system (EVMS). The second is for the contractor to provide necessary data directly into SSA's in-house EVMS.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?

a. Explain why:

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?

Yes

- a. If "yes," what is the date? 9/5/2006
 - b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?
 - 1. If "no," briefly explain why:

I.D. Performance Information

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

Performance Information Table 1:

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous	Planned Performance	Performance Metric Results
			Year)	Metric (Target)	(Actual)
	ensure superior stewardship of	Percent of outstanding SSI debt in a collection arrangement	2003 - 55.0%,	2004 - 55%	2004 - 53.5%

Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Increase Agency productivity by 2% annually on average	2003 - 2.1%,	2004 - 2%	2004 - 2.2%
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Receive an unqualified opinion on SSA's financial statements from the auditors	2003, 2002, 2001 - received an unqualified opinion	2004- Receive an unqualified opinion	2004- Received an unqualified opinion
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Get to "green" on four of five PMA initiatives	2003 - one "green'	2004 - Achieve an overall rating of "green" on four of five PMA initiatives	2004 - Achieved an overall rating of "green" on three of five PMA initiatives
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Percent of SSI payments free of preventable overpayments (O/P) and underpayments (U/P)	2003 - 93.9% O/P, 98.8% U/P	2004 - 95.4% O/P, 98.8% U/P	2004 - 93.6% O/P, 98.7% U/P
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Percent of SSI payments free of preventable overpayments (O/P) and underpayments (U/P)	2004 - 93.6% O/P, 98.7% U/P	2005 - 94.9 % O/P, 98.8% U/P	2005 – 93.6% O/P, 98.6% U/P
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Percent of outstanding SSI debt in a collection arrangement	2004 - 53.5%,	2005 - 53%	2005 - 53%
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Increase Agency productivity by 2% annually on average	2004 - 2.2%	2005 - 2%	2005 - 2.8%
2005	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Receive an unqualified opinion on SSA's financial statements from the auditors	2004, 2003, 2002 - Received an unqualified opinion	2005 - Receive an unqualified opinion	2005 - Receive an unqualified opinion
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Get to "green" on the President's Management Agenda (PMA) initiatives status scores	2004 - Achieved an overall rating of "green" on three of five PMA initiatives, 2003 - one "green"	2005 - Achieve a status score of "green" on four of five PMA initiatives.	
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Percent of SSI payments free of preventable overpayments (O/P) and underpayments (U/P)	2005 93.6% O/P, 98.6% U/P	2006 95.4% O/P, 98.8% U/P	2006 - Available June 2007

	Strategic Goal(s)		Actual/baseline	Planned	Performance
Year	Supported	Measure	(from Previous Year)	Performance Metric (Target)	Metric Results (Actual)
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Percent of outstanding SSI debt in a collection arrangement	2005 - 53%,	2006- 55%	2006 - 53%
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Continue to achieve 2%, on average, annual productivity improvements	2005 - 2.8%,	2006 - 2%	2006 - 2.49% on average
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Receive an unqualified opinion on SSA's financial statements from the auditors	2005, 2004, 2003 - Received an unqualified opinion	2006 - Receive an unqualified opinion	2006 - Received an unqualified opinion
	Stewardship - to ensure superior stewardship of Social Security programs and resources	Get to "green" on the President's Management Agenda (PMA) initiatives status scores	2005 - Achieved a status score of "green" on three of five PMA initiatives,	2006 - Achieve a status score of "green" on four of five PMA initiatives	2006 - Achieved a status score of "green" on four of five PMA initiatives
		Percent of SSI payments free of overpayments (O/P) and underpayments (U/P)	2006 - Available June 2007,	2007 95.7% O/P, 98.8% U/P	TBD
2007	Stewardship - to protect the integrity of Social Security programs through superior Stewardship	Percent of outstanding SSI debt in a collection arrangement	2006 - 53%,	2007- 56%	TBD
	integrity of Social	Continue to achieve 2%, on average, annual productivity improvements	2006 - 2.49% on average	2007 - 2% on average	TBD
	Stewardship - to protect the integrity of Social Security programs through superior Stewardship	Receive an unqualified opinion on SSA's financial statements from the auditors	2006 - Received an unqualified opinion		TBD
	Security programs	Get to "green" on the President's Management Agenda (PMA) initiatives status scores	2006 - Achieved a status score of "green" on four of five PMA initiatives,	2007 - Achieve a status score of "green" on five of five PMA initiatives	TBD
	Stewardship - to protect the integrity of Social Security programs through superior Stewardship	Percent of SSI payments free of overpayments (O/P) and underpayments (U/P)	2007 – TBD	2008 96.6% O/P, 98.8% U/P	TBD
	17	Percent of outstanding SSI debt in a collection	2007 – TBD	2008 - 57%	TBD

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
	Security programs through superior Stewardship	arrangement			
	protect the integrity of Social	Continue to achieve 2%, on average, annual productivity improvements		2008 - 2% on average	TBD

I.E. Security and Privacy

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

All systems supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system/s to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system/s.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

- 1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment:
- 2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.

 Yes

3. Systems in Planning - Security Table:

	Stewardship - to protect the integrity of Social	Receive an unqualified opinion on SSA's financial	2007 – TBD	2008 - Receive an unqualified opinion	TBD
	Security programs through superior	statements from the auditors			
	Stewardship				
2008	Stewardship - to		2007 – TBD	2008 - Maintain a	TBD
	protect the	the President's		status score of	
	integrity of Social	Management		"green" on five of	
	Security programs	Agenda (PMA)		five PMA initiatives	
	through superior	initiatives status			
	Stewardship	scores			

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four

different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

Performance Information Table 2:

Fiscal	Measurement	Measurement	Measurement	Measurement	Baseline	Planned	Actual
Year	Area	Category	Grouping	Indicator		Improvement	Results
						to the Baseline	

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor	Planned	Planned or Actual C&A
	Operated System?	Operational Date	Completion Date
Supplemental Security Income Record Maintenance System	Government Only	6/30/2007	7/23/2004

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact Ievel	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37?	Date C&A Complete	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests?	Date Complete(d): Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
Supplemental Security Income Record Maintenance System	Government Only	Moderate	Yes	7/23/2004	NIST 800- 26	7/31/2006	1/9/2006

- 5. Have any weaknesses related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?
- a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated agency's plan of action and milestone process?
- 6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?

a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

THIS IS NOT A CONTRACTOR SYSTEM

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?		Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	
Supplemental Security Income Records Management System	No	Yes.	Yes.	Yes	Yes, because the existing Privacy Act system of records was substantially revised in FY 06.

I.F. Enterprise Architecture (EA)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

- 1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes
 - a. If "no," please explain why?
- 2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? $_{\text{Yes}}$
- a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

Access to Financial Institution Information (AFII)

- b. If "no," please explain why?
 - 3. Service Reference Model (SRM) Table:

Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	Service	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
Connect: Direct	Connect: Direct automates the secure movement of large volumes of data between distributed applications within and between enterprises.	Back Office	Data Management		Data Exchange	016-00-01- 04-02- 2132-00	Internal	0
QA2	Certification	Rusiness		Configuration Management	Management	016-00-01- 04-02- 2132-00	Internal	0
DRMS		Digital Asset Services	Knowledge Management	Categorization	Categorization	016-00-01- 04-02- 2132-00	Internal	0

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	Service	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
	Software Life Cycle. The DRMS is used to maintain data integrity. It supports programmers working with both CICS and Data Base Architecture applications.							
SSH	Secure Shell (SSL) is a program to log into another computer over a network, to		Security Management	Access Control	Access Control	016-00-01- 04-02- 2132-00	Internal	0
Top Secret	TOP SECRET is the security software running on all of SSA's mainframe systems.	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control	Access Control	016-00-02- 00-01- 2210-00	Internal	0
ATS	The purpose of the Audit Trail System (ATS) is to provide an effective tool to deter, detect, investigate and prosecute instances of fraud and abuse.	Support Services	Security Management		Audit Trail Capture and Analysis	016-00-01- 02-02- 2130-00	Internal	0

Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission. 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

4. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product	
				name)	
Audit Trail Capture	Component	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	COBOL 3	
and Analysis	Framework	Dusiness Logic	riationii bependent	COBOL 3	
Configuration	Component	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	Visual Basic .Net (VB.Net)	
Management	Framework	Dusiness Logic	riationii Dependent		
Data Exchange	Component	Data Interchange	I Jata Evchange	Resource Description	
	Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	Framework (RDF)	
Configuration	Component	Data Management		Active Data Objects .Net	
Management	Framework	Data Management	Connectivity	(ADO.Net)	
Categorization	Component	Data Management	Database	DB2 Connector	
	Framework	Data Management	Connectivity		
Configuration	Component	Data Management		Open Database	
Management	Framework	9	Connectivity	Connectivity (ODBC)	
Configuration	Component	Presentation /	Dynamic Server-	Active Server Pages .Net	
Management	Framework	Interface	Side Display	(ASP.Net)	
Categorization	Component	Security	Supporting Security	TopSecret	
outegorization	Framework	Security	Services		
Access Control	Component	Security	Supporting Security	TopSecret	
7100033 00111101	Framework	3	Services	Торосстет	
Access Control	Service Access and		Authentication /		
	Delivery	Requirements	Single Sign-on		
Audit Trail Capture	Service Access and	Service	Hosting	Internal (within Agency)	
and Analysis	Delivery	Requirements	riosting	mieriai (within rigeriey)	
Data Exchange	Service Access and	Service	Hosting	Internal (within Agency)	
	Delivery	Requirements			
Categorization	Service Access and	Service	Hosting	Internal (within Agency)	
	Delivery	Requirements	3		
Configuration	Service Access and	Service	Hosting	Internal (within Agency)	
Management	Delivery	Requirements	-		
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Service	Hosting	Internal (within Agency)	
		Requirements Service	Legislative /		
Access Control	Service Access and Delivery	Requirements	Compliance	Security	
	Delivery	Requirements	Enterprise		
Audit Trail Capture	Service Interface	Integration	Application	CICS	
and Analysis	and Integration	integration	Integration	0103	
	Service Interface				
Access Control	and Integration	Integration	Middleware	CICS	
	Service Interface		Service Description	Application Program	
Data Exchange	and Integration	Interface	/ Interface	Interface (API) / Protocol	
	Service Platform	Database /		, ,	
Categorization	and Infrastructure	Storage	Database	Database 2 (DB2)	
D . E .	Service Platform				
Data Exchange	and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers		
Audit Trail Capture	Service Platform	Hardware /	Daniela anala	Direct Access Storage	
and Analysis	and Infrastructure	Infrastructure	Peripherals	Device (DASD)	
	Service Platform	Hardware /	Dorinharala	Direct Access Storage	
Categorization	and Infrastructure	Infrastructure	Peripherals	Device (DASD)	
Audit Trail Capture	Service Platform	Hardware /	Dorinharala	Mainframa	
and Analysis	and Infrastructure Infrastructure		Peripherals	Mainframe	
Access Control	Service Platform	Hardware /	Servers /	Mainframe	

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
	and Infrastructure	Infrastructure	Computers	
Audit Trail Capture	Service Platform	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	COBOL 3
and Analysis	and Infrastructure	Support Hattorins	riationii Bependent	COBOL 3

Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

- 5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

 No
 - a. If "yes," please describe.
- 6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system? $^{\rm No}$
- a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?
- 1. If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).

Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information

II.A. Alternatives Analysis

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A- 94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?

Yes

- a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? 7/15/2006
 - b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?
 - c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Removed

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?

The selected alternative included the automation of the current paper-based process for accessing financial account information using a financial services vendor with established network infrastructure and messaging capability within the industry as part of its current business process. This allows for implementation of the proposed automated process in an effective and efficient manner. This is the only viable alternative to increase the effectiveness of the current paper-based process for accessing financial account information. This is because there is no other public or private sector entity that the capability to automate the verification process in a cost-effective manner.

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

Reduction in overpayments associated with incorrect payments. Expected benefits are under review based on pilot experience.

II.B. Risk Management

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

- 1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?
- a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?
- b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

Nc

- c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:
- 2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?
 - a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?
 - b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?
- 3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

SSA's baselines are risk adjusted in terms of both life cycle schedule and resource estimates. Factors considered in determining baseline risk adjustments include: identification of known and types of unknown program and technology risks, the likelihood of occurrence, the impact in the event the risk occurs, and the mitigation strategy adopted to manage each risk. The intent of adopting this strategy is for the program to be able to absorb inevitable risk occurrences and still achieve end cost and schedule objectives. This practice (along with our risk management policies and procedures) has to date been a successful one at SSA. Small management reserves are held at the Deputy Commissioner level in the event required.

II.C. Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748?

Yes

- 2. Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):
 - a. What is the Planned Value (PV)?
- 0.746000
 - b. What is the Earned Value (EV)?
- 0.746000
 - c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?
- 0.746000
- d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?

Contractor and Government

- e. "As of" date:
- 9/30/2006
- 3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI = EV/PV)? 1.000000
- 4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?

5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?

1.000000

6. What is the cost variance (CV=EV-AC)?

0

7. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)

No

- a. If "yes," was it the?
- b. If "yes," explain the variance:
- c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?
- 8. Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year?

Νo